

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

MICHAEL GRALLA,

No. C 11-01334 RS

Petitioner,

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

v.

ANTHONY HEDGEPEETH,

Respondent.

I. INTRODUCTION

Petitioner Michael Gralla filed this action for a writ of habeas corpus, per 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The petition is now before the Court for review pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2243 and Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. Petitioner has paid the filing fee.

II. DISCUSSION

This Court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus “in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a). A district court considering an application for a writ of habeas corpus shall “award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto.” 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Summary dismissal is appropriate only where the allegations in the petition are vague or conclusory,

1 palpably incredible, or patently frivolous or false. *See Hendricks v. Vasquez*, 908 F.2d 490, 491 (9th  
2 Cir. 1990).

3 As grounds for federal habeas relief, petitioner claims: (1) he was denied due process  
4 because the trial court failed to conduct a competency hearing despite evidence raising a bona fide  
5 doubt about his competency to stand trial and be sentenced; (2) his due process rights were violated  
6 because he was not competent at the time of his trial, sentencing, or resentencing; and (3) he  
7 received ineffective assistance of counsel. Liberally construed, the claims appear to be cognizable  
8 on federal habeas review.

#### 9 IV. CONCLUSION

10 1. Counsel for petitioner shall serve a copy of this Order and the petition and all attachments  
11 thereto, on respondent and respondent's counsel, the Attorney General for the State of California.

12 2. Within ninety (90) days of receiving service of this Order, Respondent shall file an  
13 answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing  
14 cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted based on petitioner's cognizable claims.  
15 Respondent shall file with the answer a copy of all portions of the state trial record that previously  
16 have been transcribed and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.

17 3. Petitioner shall file any traverse within thirty (30) days of the date the answer is filed.

18 4. In lieu of an answer, respondent may file, within ninety (90) days of receiving service of  
19 this Order, a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes  
20 to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If respondent files such a motion, petitioner  
21 shall file an opposition or statement of non-opposition within thirty (30) days of the date the motion  
22 is filed, and respondent shall file with the Court and serve on petitioner a reply within **fifteen (15)**  
23 days of the date any opposition is filed.

24  
25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26  
27 Dated: 8/20/12

28  
  
RICHARD SEEBORG  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE